



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

mn
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/669,931	09/24/2003	Hans F. van Rietschote	5760-13900	4596
35690	7590	07/10/2007	EXAMINER	
MEYERTONS, HOOD, KIVLIN, KOWERT & GOETZEL, P.C. P.O. BOX 398 AUSTIN, TX 78767-0398			PUENTE, EMERSON C	
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2113				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
07/10/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/669,931	VAN RIETSCHOTE ET AL.	
	Examiner Emerson C. Puente	Art Unit 2113	

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Emerson C. Puente.

(3) _____.

(2) Lawerence Merkel (Reg No. 41,191).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 3 July 2007

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

25

Prior art documents discussed:

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Appellant indicated in the appeal brief that the grounds of rejection for claim 25 was incorrect (see page 10). Claim 25 should have been rejected over Vert in view of Mashayekhi and Dinker. Appellant agreed it was not necessary to reopen prosecution of application as such a change would not require the addition of new prior art or alter the issues at hand. Appellant approved examiner's modification of grounds of rejection to remove claim 25 from the second grounds of rejection (Vert in view of Mashayekhi) and place claim 25 in the third grounds of rejection (Vert in view of Mashayekhi and Dinker) in order to expedite prosecution of the case to the board. .